AMERICAN NUMISMATIC ASSOCIATION

Chartered by Congress

September 3, 1970

Mr. F. Patrick Butler
Executive Assistant, American Revolution Bicentennial Commission
735 Jackson Place N.W.
Washington, D. C. 20276

Dear Mr. Butler:

We greatly appreciated your attending our reception held on Tuesday, August 18, during the ANA convention in St. Louis. Many of those present at the reception were pleased to have an opportunity to talk with you concerning the Bicentennial celebration and the coins that could be issued by it.

It was also most interesting to have you make a statement at the business meeting on the following day. You can rest assured that your presence at our convention produced a greater interest by our members in the program for the celebration.

Pursuant to your advice to me that you would be interested in any recommendations that I would see fit to make for additional members on the coins and medals advisory panel, I wish to submit herewith the names of two eminent and nationally known numismatists who I sincerely believe can contribute ideas of value at the forthcoming meeting of the panel in Washington, D. C. on October 1, 2, 3. This advice to you is somewhat delayed because I visited Mexico City for eight days following the convention.

The names and addresses of these two persons are:

Eric P. Newman
6450 Delmar Avenue
St. Louis, Mo. 63130

Maurice M. Gould
P.O. Box 2407
Hopetown, Calif. 92008

I believe you met and talked with Mr. Newman at our convention. I am sure you learned from him that he is a foremost authority on revolutionary coins and currency. I do not know if you met Mr. Gould, but he is also one of our best known authorities and writers on numismatics. He was for many years a resident of Boston and taught courses in numismatics at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Colonial coins and the history of the revolution are also a specialty for which he is well known.

Looking forward to meeting with you at the meeting of the panel in October, I am

Most sincerely yours,

Herbert M. Maryan, President

HMM/mc
cc: Eric P. Newman ✓
Maurice M. Gould

Eric:
I hope to see you in Washington at the Panel meeting.
HMM

September the Eighth, 1970

Eric, I know just how much of your fine hand went into the making of that beautiful St. Louis convention! I trust the constant compliments were reward enough for you. You are so modest and function so quietly with such grace. Your party was delightful, and it was such fun to see you and your charming wife in your "native habitat," so reflective of the aesthetic Newmans. That same grace I mentioned above was very much in evidence as you officiated at the educational forum and

Mrs. Marion H. Russell

during the banquet. How lucky we are, that the Almighty directed your footsteps into Numismatics! On that prayerful note--with no intent of being sacrilegious--I'll close with sincere thanks for all you do, not just for the St. Louis convention.

Sincerely,

Coin World
THE WEEKLY NEWSPAPER OF THE ENTIRE NUMISMATIC FIELD
SIDNEY NEWS BUILDING PH: 513 492-4141 SIDNEY, OHIO 45365

Sept. 8, 1970

Eric Newman
6450 Cecil Ave.
St. Louis, Mo. 63105

Dear Eric:

A brief from you with your idea of what our nation should do numismatically to commemorate the American Revolution Bicentennial, climaxing in 1976, would be most important to me as a member of the ARB Commission's Coins and Medals advisory panel.

Although we have done a great deal of spade work, the panel meets for the first formal, working session in Washington October 1-3. You may be sure your opinion will be carried with me respectfully.

Here is a self-addressed envelope. At least I can save you that much time!

All the best,

COIN WORLD

Margo Russell, Editor
(Mrs. Marion)

bg

ERIC P. NEWMAN NUMISMATIC EDUCATION SOCIETY

6450 Cecil Avenue, St. Louis 5, Missouri

September 18, 1970

Mrs. Margo Russell
Coin World
Sidney News Building
Sidney, Ohio 45365

Dear Margo:

Your delightful note concerning our party and the St. Louis convention was enjoyed only by one editor over it in the editorial pain of Coin World. My wife and I found it a delight to have you and our other friends at our home. Please be sure to come back whenever you wonder this way.

You asked me, in a separate letter, what we should do to commemorate the 50-Centennial. It so happens that Mark Berger has recommended to Parker Brothers that Money Game be added to the Currency Panel. If that occurs you may not want a separate citation from us as one of your contributors. Let us think this over.

Kindest regards.

Sincerely yours,

ERIC P. NEWMAN NUMISMATIC EDUCATION SOCIETY

EPN/ebo

A NON-PROFIT CORPORATION FOR EDUCATION
THROUGH RESEARCH AND EXHIBITION
OF COINS, CURRENCY AND HISTORIC OBJECTS

+

EDISONBR STL A

T+

EDISONBR STL A

ZEILA STL A333 (DE)CTAILS CT

SIA044 BS PD SIDNEY OHIO 19 258P EDT

ERIC NEWMAN EDISON STORES INC, 314-621-7300

STL

IT IS IMPORTANT TO HAVE YOUR THINKING FOR THE SEPTEMBER 29-30

MEETING OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION BI-CENTENNIAL COMMISSION.

THIS WILL BE A SIGNIFICANT SESSION AND YOU SHOULD BE REPRESENTED

WITH AT LEAST A PRELIMINARY POSITION PAPER IF THE COMMISSION

MEMBERSHIP HAS NOT BEEN ENLARGED BY THAT TIME

MARGO RUSSELL EDITOR COIN WORLD.(303)

SEP 18 19??

A+

EDISONBR STL A

T

ERIC P. NEWMAN NUMISMATIC EDUCATION SOCIETY

6450 Cecil Avenue, St. Louis 5, Missouri

September 28, 1970

Mrs. Margo Russell
Coin World
P.O. Box 150
Sidney, Ohio 45365

Dear Margo:

You have asked me further about my feelings concerning the Bi-Centennial Commission. I feel the occasion is important enough for an official coin rather than an official medal. This would leave the private medallic companies in a position to promote medals in any way they deem best. If the official coin is distributed at a premium, I am opposed to it. I am not interested in having our government create a rare numismatic item. I feel everyone should have the right to participate in the celebration by owning such a souvenir at face.

I am also very enthusiastic about Mark Bergen's 50¢ fractional currency idea. I would like to expand on it by stating that consideration should be given to issuing several 50¢ denominations of fractional currency, each with a different theme, so that many incidents of the Revolution can be shown. It would make an exciting set to have a group of 50¢ pieces of paper money, just as the postage stamps are creating a group of stamps to cover a subject rather than only one design. A design contest might be worthwhile.

Kindest regards.

Sincerely yours,

ERIC P. NEWMAN NUMISMATIC
EDUCATION SOCIETY

EPN/mlb

A NON-PROFIT CORPORATION FOR EDUCATION
THROUGH RESEARCH AND EXHIBITION
OF COINS, CURRENCY AND HISTORIC OBJECTS

ERIC P. NEWMAN NUMISMATIC EDUCATION SOCIETY

6450 Cecil Avenue, St. Louis 5, Missouri

October 1, 1970

Mr. F. Patrick Butler
American Revolution Bi-Centennial Commission
736 Jackson Place, N.W.
Washington, D. C. 20276

Dear Patrick:

The ARBC Coins and Medals Panel meeting was unusually stimulating and well organized. Thank you for your part in that work.

Committee No. 2 on precedence, feasibility, legality, timing, distribution, etc., needs your help and Mr. Lang indicated that I may call on you to assist us.

Two of the committee members, Hon. Charles Walker, and Hon. Fred Schwengel, were not present, and I will ask them to advise me if they have any particular views to submit to the committee or to the panel. Time is short for our committee report and they may not be able to participate to a full extent with reasonable promptness because of more pressing matters. Have you any suggestions as to the extent or the area in which they would wish to participate?

Mr. Henry Grunthal, a member of Committee No. 2, will head a subcommittee to cover coin-stamp combinations and any series of medals to be sponsored for production beginning about 1971 and extending until 1976. This subcommittee will have such members of our committee No. 2 as Mr. Grunthal and myself will agree on. If we wish to add others from the panel we will secure the prior approval of the panel chairman.

If there are any suggestions which you have, please feel free to communicate them to me.

Sincerely yours,

ERIC P. NEWMAN NUMISMATIC EDUCATION SOCIETY

EPN/mtb

ERIC P. NEWMAN NUMISMATIC EDUCATION SOCIETY

6450 Cecil Avenue, St. Louis 5, Missouri

October 1, 1970

Mr. Henry Grunthal
American Numismatic Society
Broadway at 155th St.
New York, New York 10032

Dear Henry:

It was very pleasant working with you in Washington in connection with the ANS Coins and Medals Panel.

Committee No. 2, to which both of us were appointed, along with Herbert Bergen, Clifford Mishler, Val Stefanelli and Mary Brooks, and to which Margo Russell is a member ex officio, and to which Hon. Fred Schwengel, of the House of Representatives and Hon. Charles Walker, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury were appointed, but not present, has a substantial responsibility with respect to precedence, feasibility, legality, timing, packaging, distribution, and special projects.

You are to head the subcommittee with respect to medals. This means the coin-stamp promotion and the series of medals to be struck from 1971 through 1976. This requires immediate attention and you may place on the subcommittee any members of the main committee which you and I may agree on. If you wish to go beyond that I would want to get the permission of George Lang. I would suggest that Cliff Mishler work with you and, certainly, Margo Russell. There would be nothing wrong in talking to Mr. Baker of the 99 Company as to clarifying any point.

I am planning to prepare a preliminary report on coins and would like you to prepare the preliminary report on medals. If there is any information you need I know you will feel free to contact P. Patrick Butler, or any of us. I will discuss your thoughts with you shortly, by telephone, to expedite our work.

I know that our work on ANS will be of great satisfaction to both of us.

Sincerely,

ERIC P. NEWMAN NUMISMATIC
EDUCATION SOCIETY

EPN/atb

cc: Mr. P. Patrick Butler

A NON-PROFIT CORPORATION FOR EDUCATION
THROUGH RESEARCH AND EXHIBITION
OF COINS, CURRENCY AND HISTORIC OBJECTS

AMERICAN REVOLUTION BICENTENNIAL COMMISSION
736 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20276

October 15, 1970

Mr. Eric P. Newman
ERIC P. NEWMAN Numismatic
Education Society
6450 Cecil Avenue
St. Louis 5, Missouri

Dear Mr. Newman:

First let me say that I'm quite happy to see how well you have fit into the Advisory Panel and the firmness with which you have taken the subcommittee lead.

Congressman Schwengel had every intention of being at the meeting, but his scheduling was confused to such a point that he completely overlooked the dates of the Panel meetings--he definitly will wish to be informed of the subcommittees activities but is primarily concerned with historical aspects. Mr. Walker was represented by Bill Dickey from Treasury (he will be of some help, but is very conservative in attitude to any change in the Treasury position).

I will do everything I can to assist you in developing your subcommittee into an operational phase. I would like a schematic of your organization and a general outline of individual responsibility.

The PNC program is going to get caught up in administrative tanglements in both the Commission and Congress unless we can get solid backing in both areas. As yet I couldn't predict an outcome, but several unprecedented areas of consideration by the Commission will have to be met.

Sincerely,

F. Patrick Butler
Executive Assistant

ERIC P. NEWMAN NUMISMATIC EDUCATION SOCIETY

6450 Cecil Avenue, St. Louis 5, Missouri

October 28, 1970

Mr. F. Patrick Butler, Executive Assistant
American Revolution Bicentennial Commission
736 Jackson Place, N.W.
Washington, D. C. 20276

Dear Mr. Butler:

Thank you for your kind letter of October 15, 1970 and the information subsequently transmitted.

As to Congressional Newsletter, I have already heard of his sincere desire to participate actively in the Panel's activities and will look forward to his advice and assistance.

You were asked also to individual responsibilities of the committee members and how our committee will operate. I believe our committee is divided on the feasibility of where the Panel voted upon and therefore I do not believe I can assign responsibilities until I have the views of our Chairman and Vice-Chairman. I also feel that members of the committee and are public officials should determine whether they will actively participate as committee members or whether they wish to be on advisory status.

As to the PBS project, I think we should discuss it whenever you feel we can.

Sincerely,

ERIC P. NEWMAN NUMISMATIC
EDUCATION SOCIETY

EPN
atb

A NON-PROFIT CORPORATION FOR EDUCATION
THROUGH RESEARCH AND EXHIBITION
OF COINS, CURRENCY AND HISTORIC OBJECTS

Numismatic News
Serving Coin Collectors Since 1952
WEEKLY
PHONE 715 445-2217 IOLA, WIS. 54945

October 23, 1970

Mr. Eric P. Newman
6450 Cecil Avenue
St. Louis, Mo., 63105

Dear Eric:-

I have received my copy of the report on production and distribution of official bicentennial numismatic items as you have filed with George Lang, and want to offer my comments on same.

So far as technical points of the report are concerned, I have little more to offer in the way of observations than what was conveyed in my letter of October 21 relating to Henry Grunthal's medals report.

The final item in your report, the recommendation, however, does cause me a bit of concern so far as the ARBC approach to the question of bicentennial numismatic items is concerned. Specifically, " . . . this subcommittee stands ready to pursue outlined programs in depth with appropriate public officials after . . . "

You have observed that your feeling is that our asking the Congress to authorize a complete change in the coinage for the bicentennial is "impractical and may cause a rejection of the entire program," and because of disagreements within our subcommittee have refrained from reporting on the point of feasibility. This is unfortunate, as this is the real key to the entire program.

I firmly believe that before the ARBC can endorse a projected program, this panel must have determined the factor of feasibility. To do this we must approach the "public officials" and outline our proposals in advance. That's what I spent two extra days in Washington doing, both on the Hill and at Treasury, and I found them to be, shall we say, eagerly sympathetic.

I don't know if anyone else could have, or did do the same, but I would certainly be interested in hearing what anyone else found out. I certainly was not able to talk to everyone I should have, or would have liked to, and I am as prone as anyone else to sometimes drawing the wrong conclusion. However, I certainly do not think that we can afford to assume that a full coinage change can not be introduced for 1976.

I try to keep things in perspective, and I would not be pushing for such a course if I thought attainment were anything but highly practical. In talking to Treasury officials, Mrs. Brooks and Roy Cahoon, outside the forum of our panel discussions I found them interested in design changes on our full range of coins, their only firm position being that we not seek a change on just a single coin.

It must be remembered that in talking with people in such positions where their voice is being recorded they must assume a position in favor of the status quo, unless they are provided with different direction from the President, and sometimes from Congress. They can not initiate legislation, they can only carry out the intent of the law.

With respect to other portions of your report, I do have a couple minor observations to offer. First, under precedents, the reverse of the Lincoln cent may not be changed until 1984, except with Congressional authorization. Second, under legislation, Congressional leadership in any move with respect to coin design changes is not simply a "practical necessity," it is mandatory. The Treasury would be highly unlikely to institute any changes on even the eligible coins unless the Congress offered leadership.

Again, at this point no evidence has been brought to my attention which would cause me to veer from my position that to ask for anything short of a change of design for the entire range of the nation's circulating coins for the bicentennial observance would be doing an injustice to the event being commemorated.

Sincerely yours,

Clifford Mishler
Numismatic Editor

CM/ns

ERIC P. NEWMAN NUMISMATIC EDUCATION SOCIETY

6450 Cecil Avenue, St. Louis 5, Missouri

October 24, 1970

Dr. Clifford Mishler
Iola, Wisconsin 54945

Dear Cliff:

Thanks for yours of October 23, 1970. The report filed with Dr. Lenz is tentative and had to meet a deadline. When the next report is made it will reflect more of your thoughts as outlined in your recent letters.

There is a difference of opinion on feasibility and I have to report it. I hope it can be ironed out. I recognize your enthusiasm and confidence based upon your findings.

Did you talk to Mrs. Sullivan, as she is from St. Louis, and I would like to know what took place before I see her.

Your suggestion as to changing the reverse of the small medals each year also has merit, I believe, but we both agree Congress must do it.

As to the distinction between "practical socially" and "numismatic", I am sure we are in accord but only differ in the technicality of the words.

I am enclosing copies of some letters I have received on our work. These are not for publication, naturally, but indicate how many things need to be ironed out.

Kindest regards.

Sincerely yours,

ERIC P. NEWMAN NUMISMATIC
EDUCATION SOCIETY

EPN
mlb

A NON-PROFIT CORPORATION FOR EDUCATION
THROUGH RESEARCH AND EXHIBITION
OF COINS, CURRENCY AND HISTORIC OBJECTS

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20560

November 2, 1970

Mr. Eric P. Newman, Chairman
Coin Committee No. 2 of the
ARBC Coins and Medals Panel
P.O. Box 14020
St. Louis, Missouri 63178

Dear Eric:

Under separate cover I am sending you the recent edition of Laws Authorizing Issuance of Medals and Commemorative Coins, compiled by Gilman G. Udell, Superintendent, Document Room, House of Representatives. I trust you will find it useful.

With best regards.

Very sincerely yours,

V. Clain-Stefanelli
Curator
Division of Numismatics

ERIC P. NEWMAN NUMISMATIC EDUCATION SOCIETY

6450 Cecil Avenue, St. Louis 5, Missouri

November 9, 1970

Mr. V. Clain-Stefanelli, Curator
Division of Numismatics
Smithsonian Institution
Washington, D. C. 20560

Dear Val:

Thank you for the compilation of numismatic legislation.

Best regards to both of you.

Sincerely,

ERIC P. NEWMAN NUMISMATIC
EDUCATION SOCIETY

ENN/atl

1973 –

Special Operations

Provisions –

November 16, 1970

Mr. Don Taxay
Nummus Press
Box 1058
Flushing, New York 11355

Dear Don:

The reason for my delay in answering your last letter was that I gave a talk to the American Philosophical Society. Julian Boyd was kind with his remarks about it as were many other members and I was pleased to have them even in attendance.

I have tried to recall the medical journal in which your book was reviewed but cannot. It was sent to me by Walter Baumgarten, M.D., 5505 Delmar Blvd., St. Louis, Missouri 63112 and if you want to write him, feel free to do so.

As to your Indian book, I would expect you to send it to me without my asking, but, since you ask me to ask, I ask. I look forward to it.

The ANSC matter is really in a bind. The objection to spending the money on old-fashioned celebrations when there are so many human needs is substantially justified. Perhaps we should devote a share of the proceeds of our program to nursery schools in ghettos, or the like, but imagine getting Congress to agree on an expenditure.

I am glad that you do not find me the personification of the Devil, as some do. You have had more than your share of difficulty with numismatic associates, but you came out on top.

Let me hear from you more often.

Sincerely,

ERIC P. NEWMAN NUMISMATIC
EDUCATION SOCIETY

EPN/atb

December 24, 1970

SUMMARY SHEET
COINS/MEDALS
RECOMMENDATION #1

RECOMMENDATION: *THAT A CHANGE OF DESIGN BE INSTITUTED ON ALL COIN-OF-THE-REALM FOR THE BICENTENNIAL ANNIVERSARY (The design changes established in 1976 would then be in effect for the statutory requirement of 25 years)*

I. Background: The Congress in 1890 laid down the Law that the design on the coins of the United States could not be changed more than once in twenty-five years. The purpose of this rule was to prevent multiplicity of coinage issues and the consequent confusion of the public and the facilitation of counterfeiting. All circulation coinage (coin-of-the-realm) will have passed the twenty-five year mark by 1976 with the exception of the 1959 reverse Lincoln Head cent and the Kennedy half-dollar. Any change in these two coins would require special Congressional consideration. Since many of our coin designs are appreciably older than 25 years, and in view of the forthcoming two-hundredth anniversary of the United States, the Advisory Panel recommended a change in design (either moderate or complete) to remind all Americans of the special significance of 1976.

II. Agency and Group Positions: The stand of the U.S. Mint on Commemorative Coins has traditionally been against special issues. This policy was created in an effort to block general public abuse and profiteering from commemorative issues. The abuse stems almost solely from the uniqueness of the single commemorative issue and therefore is not necessarily analogous to the recommended change in the coin-of-the-realm which in effect would make a commemorative piece out of every coin struck by the Mint. Actual hoarding of these newly designed coins cannot be predicted but the Mint has reservations, despite the many commemorative medal program envisioned to satisfy public need. The collecting societies, private enterprise, (numismatically oriented) and the public in general seem to desire a change. Some Congressional members involved in numismatics have also expressed a desire for new designs.

III. Advisory Panel Vote: (Reference: Transcript of Proceedings, Advisory Panel on Coins and Medals, September 30, 1970; pages 93-95).

FOR: 12, AGAINST: 1

IV. Chairman's Recommendations: The Advisory Panel weighed many considerations in making this recommendation. They felt quite strongly that such ubiquitous articles in the daily life of all Americans would bring the Bicentennial message to everyone. I concur that the contributions of such a program far outweigh the disadvantages.

SUMMARY SHEET
COINS/MEDALS #2
RECOMMENDATION

RECOMMENDATION: *THAT A COMMEMORATIVE COIN BE AUTHORIZED SPECIFICALLY FOR THE BICENTENNIAL WHICH WOULD BE BOTH UNIQUE IN DESIGN AND COMPOSITION*

I. Background: Commemorative Coins have a very strong appeal to the public because they are usually official currency, yet they are specifically designed for a particular event and, in the past, made in very limited quantity in comparison to the coins-of-the-realm. The net result is that such commemorative coins become much more valuable than their face value and therefore are hoarded and used as objects of speculation. Such past public reaction to commemoratives places an extreme hardship on the U.S. Mint production capacity; therefore, such reaction defeats the purpose of the coinage system.

II. Agency and Group Positions: The Treasury Department opposes the minting of special-event, non-circulating Commemorative Coins. The abuses that stem from such Commemorative Coins, however, are not necessarily permanent. Commemorative Coins have been produced by the Mint in the past for private account where the Commemorative Coins were made at the Mint for cost, and delivered to the private organization for distribution. This method of distribution opened the way for profiteering and abuse of the commemorative. It has been suggested by the Panel that the Commemorative Coin be distributed by the Mint much the same as its proofsets and therefore under public account. (Definition of public account and private account on following page.)

III. Advisory Panel Vote: (Reference: Transcript of Proceedings, Advisory Panel on Coins and Medals, September 30, 1970; page 110).

FOR: 9, AGAINST: 4.

IV. Chairman's Recommendations: The Commemorative Coin would provide a beautiful commemorative piece made specifically for public consumption. The price would be similar to the proofsets and distributed under the same condition. Since the commemoratives would be sold by the Mint under public account, the Treasury itself would receive seigniorage (difference between cost of production and face value). I feel this program has some very good aspects to it, and, therefore, I believe it should be passed and the ultimate responsibility left with Congress.

DEFINITIONS

"Private account" means that the Commemorative Coins were produced at the U.S. Mint and sold to a private organization at the cost of production. This organization then distributed and sold the coins as they saw fit.

"Public account" means that Commemorative Coins produced by the U.S. Mint would also be distributed and sold by the Mint at or near the cost of production with set limits of purchase for each buyer.

SUMMARY SHEET
COINS/MEDALS #3a
RECOMMENDATION #3b

RECOMMENDATION: *(A) Consideration should be given to the issuance of a Commemorative Fractional Currency piece in limited numbers;*

(B) The issuance of a two-dollar bill with a Bicentennial design.

I. Background: Fractional Currency in 50 cent denomination could be issued to commemorate the continental and colonial currency used so extensively during the Revolutionary Period. Fractional Currency in denominations ranging from 5 to 50 cents was also used successfully during the Civil War. The issue of Fractional Currency would not affect the regular issues of paper currency in which changes in design would not meet with approval from the Bureau of Engraving and Printing. Fractional Currency would be issued if approved only for the year 1976. There is precedence for design changes on regular currency - one of the latest being the Canadian Centennial.

II. Agency and Group Positions: The Treasury is very much opposed to any change in existing paper currency items, the principal reason being the impact that it would have on the counterfeit deterrents, the security value of the currency as it exists. The Federal Reserve System, through the Board of Governors, has traditionally been totally opposed to any numismatic prejudice associated currency. A more viable proposal would be the issuance of the Fractional Currency as a U.S. Note by the Treasury. Legislation, however, would be required in either case.

If it is decided by Congress that there will be a two-dollar bill, this would mean it has Federal Reserve endorsement. It would be put into the stream of currency through the Federal Reserve System. The Secretary of the Treasury would make the design determination, hopefully including a Bicentennial connotation.

III. Advisory Panel Vote: (Reference: Transcript of Proceedings, Advisory Panel on Coins and Medals; September 30, 1970; page 232).

A. Fractional Currency.....Unanimous - for the recommenda

B. Two-Dollar Currency.....Unanimous - for the recommenda

IV. Chairman's Recommendations: Fractional Currency and the two-dollar bill design changes are two proposals which hold considerable promise for commemorating the Bicentennial in a traditional and, at the same time, contemporary fashion. The proposals must be well researched, however, as to their advisability and feasibility. Therefore, I recommend that we should make further investigations over the period of the next 12 months so that the President and Congress can consider such ideas based on more comprehensive and explicit data.

SUMMARY SHEET
COINS/MEDALS
RECOMMENDATION #4

RECOMMENDATION: *THAT A PHILATELIC-NUMISMATIC COMMEMORATIVE PIECE BE ISSUED ANNUALLY FOR SALE TO THE PUBLIC FOR A PERIOD OF NOT LESS THAN SIX AND NOT MORE THAN THIRTEEN YEARS.*

I. Background: A philatelic-numismatic combination is the presentation of a Commemorative Medal with a Commemorative Stamp (usually representing one specific event) in a specially designed envelope which is postmarked and cancelled on the eventful date at a pertinent, historical location.

This concept will simultaneously provide a program perpetuating the significance of the Bicentennial of the nation in a very meaningful and tangible fashion and at the same time will develop revenues needed to support the activities of the Commission.

II. Agency and Group Positions: This program has the ability to develop revenue for support of Bicentennial programs early in the Bicentennial Era, which would help defray some costs and concomitantly portray a Bicentennial message which would coincide with the direction given by Congress. The philatelic-numismatic commemorative should be pleasing to the stamp and medal societies and the general public for its uniqueness and message. It may in some ways reduce the market for private business by virtue of competition but should help develop the field of collecting and the consumer market overall.

III. Advisory Panel Vote: (Reference: Transcript of Proceedings, Advisory Panel on Coins and Medals, September 30, 1970, page 144).

UNANIMOUS - in favor of the Recommendation

IV. Chairman's Recommendation: The Advisory Panel and ARBC staff have researched this particular program as you may see in PART III. Based on available information, we have concluded that, at this point, it is possible to begin distribution of such a commemorative package by Independence Day or sometime shortly after. PART III is the blueprint for such a program and the prototype for others to follow. I suggest continued research and further work to develop legislation and all details regarding execution of this program.

SUMMARY SHEET

COINS/MEDALS #5

RECOMMENDATION

RECOMMENDATION: *THAT A NATIONAL BICENTENNIAL MEDAL BE STRUCK BY THE U.S. MINT.*

I. Background: Numerous precedents exist for National Medals. The Medal should be singularly identifiable in both its obverse and reverse as the National Medal commemorating American independence in 1976. The Medal, as approved by the Commission and with concurrence of the Secretary of the Treasury, would be struck in uniform sizes and of common and precious metals. In order that sufficient numbers of Medals are produced, the striking and stockpiling would begin an adequate period of time prior to 1976. Distribution of the Medals would probably begin no earlier than July 4, 1975, and end on or before December 31, 1983. Various outlets for the widest distribution of the Medals as possible will be surveyed and reported on for Commission approval.

II. Agency and Group Positions: The Treasury would gladly accept the privilege of striking the National Medal. The U.S. Mint has a long history of designing and striking National Medals. Certain members of Congress have endorsed both the concept of a National Medal and its striking by the U.S. Mint. Furthermore, the numismatic society places greater significance on official issues of National Medals produced by the U.S. Mint. The public in general, as indicated by correspondence, is seeking a National Medal. Congress has included the consideration for a Commemorative Medal in its Bicentennial legislation. Private enterprise involved in numismatics seems to reflect mixed emotions concerning the issuance of a National Medal. Some believe it is not necessary; others look for its authorization, but feel it should be struck privately.

III. Advisory Panel Vote: (Reference: Transcript of Proceedings, Advisory Panel on Coins and Medals, September 30, 1970; page 155).

UNANIMOUS - in favor of the recommendation

IV. Chairman's Recommendations: National Medals have been struck for many occasions in American history, the 1876 Centennial, the Civil War Centennial, and Inaugurations, to name but a few. The Bicentennial should certainly maintain the tradition and inspire the U.S. Mint to create the finest medal possible.

SUMMARY SHEET
COINS/MEDALS
RECOMMENDATION #6

RECOMMENDATION: *THAT THE STATE BICENTENNIAL COMMISSIONS ESTABLISH STATE MEDALS FOR DISTRIBUTION TO THE PUBLIC AND THAT THEIR MEDALS BE STRUCK BY PRIVATE ORGANIZATIONS.*

I. Background: Each State Bicentennial Commission will probably establish a State Medal for 1976 portraying significant historical events or persons. Hopefully each State will wish to participate in developing a uniform standard for the production of these Medals. The Commission could promote this uniformity by withholding the imprimatur from any State which creates Medals that would not coincide with the national set.

II. Agency and Group Positions: The State and private sector should be encouraged to work together in developing these State Medals. Such cooperation would provide fund raising opportunities for the States and give excellent business opportunities to the private sector and finally, release the U.S. Mint for other commemorative programs.

III. Advisory Panel Vote: (Reference: Transcript of Proceedings Advisory Panel on Coins and Medals, September 30, 1970; page 174).

UNANIMOUS - in favor of the Recommendation

IV. Chairman's Recommendations: The State Bicentennial Commissions are relatively free to establish their own programs, numismatic and otherwise. The Commission should take cognizance, however, of the overall size, composition, and design of each State Medal so that the public may have the opportunity of acquiring one official, uniform set. This would allow the ARBC to oversee the quality of the State Medal.

SUMMARY SHEET
COINS/MEDALS #7
RECOMMENDATION

RECOMMENDATION: *THAT AN AWARDS MEDAL BE CREATED BY THE COMMISSION, STRUCK BY PRIVATE INDUSTRY IN VERY LIMITED QUANTITIES AND MADE OF PRECIOUS METALS AS A PRESENTATION PIECE IN RECOGNITION OF MERITORIOUS SERVICE.*

I. Background: The American Revolution Bicentennial Commission will undoubtedly make awards for presentation to those individuals and organizations who have shown outstanding leadership and support for Bicentennial programs.

II. Agency and Group Positions: An Awards Medal would undoubtedly lend itself, by the nature of composition and aesthetic value, to any presentation made by the Commission. The Medal can be designed and produced by either the U.S. Mint or privately. The Awards Medal concept is purely at the discretion of the Commission.

III. Advisory Panel Vote: (Reference: Transcripts of Proceedings, Advisory Panel on Coins and Medals, September 30, 1970; page 164).

FOR: 9, AGAINST: 1, ABSENT: 3.

IV. Chairman's Recommendations: The Awards Medal would fulfill a need that will soon be upon the Commission. Once the Commission imprimatur is available, it is recommended that a designer be commissioned to create the Medal.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE ISSUANCE OF SEVERAL MEDALS TO COMMEMORATE THE BICENTENNIAL OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

Pursuant to the discussions held and the decisions reached at the meeting of the ARBC Panel on coins and medals, the following recommendations as to medals are submitted:

a. The medals should be national in character and issued by the Commission for distribution to as many people as possible.

b. They should be produced by a United States Mint and only in case of necessity subcontracted to private mints or medallic art companies which might be better equipped to strike the larger size medals.

c. The first medal should be dated 1971 and should be issued in two diameters, 1-1/2 inches and 2-1/2 inches. Each medal should be struck in two materials, bronze and sterling silver. A unique specimen struck in gold should be presented to the President of the United States. The same procedure should be followed in each year from 1972 through 1976.

d. The design of each medal should be in accordance with the criteria of the art and history committee of the Panel.

e. An Act of Congress approving the series should be sought as the sales potential would be much greater. The Mint has indicated it would make the medals on either basis.

f. The selling price of the medals should be kept at a minimum, particularly for the smallest size in bronze, so that every school child can afford to own one.

g. The distribution of these medals should be through the newly created Numismatic Service Agency of the Mint, if possible, but could be through a commercial enterprise such as the Paramount International Coin Corporation of Englewood, Ohio.

h. Packaging should be in a simple box, but with a stand for the larger size medals in order to facilitate presentation in show cases or mounting in the home.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE ISSUANCE OF SEVERAL MEDALS TO COMMEMORATE THE BICENTENNIAL OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

i. The date of release of such medals should coincide with Independence Day of the years 1971 through 1976.

j. Quantities to be struck should be left open until a useful estimate based on the response to advertising and solicitation of orders can be obtained.

k. Post Office cooperation in orders and deliveries should be sought.

l. In addition to the six medals outlined under Sections a-k, I would recommend the adoption of one or more medals, different in design, for distribution with the issuance of stamps commemorating the occasion. These medals should be tied in by design to the commemorative postage stamps, and could be mailed in philatelic mailers. Such a philatelic-numismatic combination has a great revenue potential for the A. R. B. C. The Commission could avail itself of the "99 Company" which has a patent for such a combination mailer. The order filling and mailing could be turned over to an independent agency such as the Paramount International Coin Corporation if ARBC or the Post Office Department cannot handle the matter.

(Submitted by Henry Grunthal
and revised by Eric P. Newman.
Commentary requested promptly).

REPORT OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON ART AND HISTORY

AMERICAN REVOLUTION BICENTENNIAL COMMISSION

ADVISORY PANEL ON COINS AND MEDALS

The primary task of our Subcommittee is to help create historically-meaningful and artistically-valid mementos of the Bicentennial in the field of circulating media. The ARBC Coins and Medals Panel in its meetings has canvassed and examined the findings of experts in the field as well as opinions from the public.

Its recommendations relate to the following areas:

I. Coinage;

II. Medals;

III. Paper currencies.

General Recommendations

In order to fulfill the mandate given to this Subcommittee, we must establish guidelines that would enable us to produce through our numismatic program a true reflection of the ideas and aspirations of our own generation in relation to the ideals of our founding fathers. At the same time, we should be constantly guided by the awareness that we have to create inspiring symbols for future generations as well as a dignified image of our country for the entire world. With this purpose in mind, highest quality should be our constant goal.

The impact created by medals, and especially coins and other circulating media like paper currencies and stamps, is based on two factors: their symbolic meaning and their esthetic appearance. Since both factors are of a highly intellectual nature, our Subcommittee must increase the number of its Advisors by adding some of the leading and most prestigious figures in the field of American History and American Art. The names of some of our most revered history and art scholars of the Revolutionary Period as well as the names of some of our sculptors of world renown, representing perhaps both trends, the more traditional as well as the more contemporary styles, would be of invaluable assistance in our work. They would fulfill a dual role: to provide expert guidance in selecting the appropriate symbolism for highlighting the most relevant historical aspects to be commemorated; and to guarantee a successful selective process when judging the artistic aspects of our numismatic program. Their nationally-recognized eminence would lend substance and prestige to our activity and above all it would constitute a guarantee to present and future generations that we have made every possible effort to secure the best results through the highest degree of competence.

This recommendation, which would include a number of experts not to exceed eight, reflects strongly-expressed views and is in concordance with the statement of our Chairman, who indicated that the size and representation of this Panel is flexible and subject to appointments made by him.

Specific Recommendations

The Coinage

The coins of our Nation represent the best-suited instrument to diffuse the message of the Bicentennial. Through them, every citizen will be reminded of these historic moments and he will become a part of them no matter how remote in body or spirit he might be from the festivities.

With this thought in mind, the ARBC Coins and Medals Panel strongly supported a publicly-expressed quest for a change in the design of our coinage. Selections of new coin designs are the prerogative of the Director of the Mint, who acts with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury. In some instances, Congress can and has prescribed new coin designs, such as was the case of the Washington Bicentennial

in 1932. As a rule the design on a coin cannot be changed more often than once every 25 years, except when Congress determines otherwise (f.i., the Kennedy half dollar). For four of our six coins, the statutory 25-year period has elapsed; for one coin, the Lincoln cent, only the obverse falls under the same category. In all the above-cited cases, legislation is not needed to implement any change; it would be required only in the case of the half dollar, the reverse design of the cent, and possibly the dollar if the Eisenhower design should be adopted in the meantime. The new coinage, although commemorative in character, like many of our presently circulating coins will become the regular media of exchange for the next decades.

After the necessary legislative approval has been obtained from Congress, competition should be announced by the Secretary of the Treasury. The ARBC Coins and Medals Panel took into consideration the fact that an open competition would induce the widest national participation, as befitting for a similar occasion, being able at the same time to tap unknown artistic potentials of our Nation.

In this case artists of every media, not only sculptor-medallists, should be invited to submit drawings for the new coinage. Their entries could cover all six coins or only some of them.

The Design

The iconographical themes for the various denominations should be based on the advice obtained from leading historians; they should be indicated only in broad general lines trying to emphasize "ideas associated with the Revolution, ideas that have vitally influenced the development of the United States, world affairs and mankind's quest for freedom". The artists should be given the freedom either to follow the themes indicated by the Panel or express through different themes ideas of their own connected with the above-mentioned ideals. Through this method, we would secure the greatest freedom of expression of the artists and give them the opportunity of contributing through new approaches and new concepts to a wider horizon.

If the results of an open competition should not produce the desired results as some contend, a closed invitational competition involving a small select number of sculptors or even a direct commission to one of our leading artists should

follow immediately, using in that case more narrowly-defined themes. In this latter case, a special advisory group of experts chosen from among the members of the Panel should present a list of six or more selected artists. Another group of highly competent art experts should have the final and determining vote on the jury. In the first phase of the competition, the artists would have to submit pencil sketches of their projects, the winner or winners would then have to complete plaster models which would comply with the specifications established by the Director of the Mint. Special rules and regulations would have to be established at a later phase for each kind of competition.

In case of an open competition, money awards will be given only to the winner or winners. In the case of a closed competition, each invited artist would have to be given a lesser amount for his submitted design while the prize money would go to the winner or winners.

Special Commemorative Coin

The ARBC Coins and Medals Panel recommended also a coin of a purely commemorative character sponsored by the ARBC. To conform with tradition, a commemorative half dollar or

possibly a dollar could be distributed either by the ARBC or by some agent at a premium price and the profits used to finance any project connected with the Bicentennial. This coin, although legal tender at its face value, will cater primarily to souvenir and coin collectors. Without diminishing its great historical and artistic potentials, we should bear in mind that it will neither have the same diffusion nor the same impact on the entire Nation as a new coinage would have. As an addition to a newly-designed coinage, it undoubtedly will assert its merits of a highly desirable memento of the Bicentennial. The denomination of a similar commemorative coin would have to be determined at a later stage by the Panel and the necessary legislation obtained.

The Design and Content

The historical theme of a similar commemorative coin should most definitely be selected by a group of leading historians. The esthetic requirements for the design and manufacture of a similar coin could follow the same regulations established for the regular coinage, the only difference being that a closed competition would seem more appropriate in this case.

The Medal Program

An Official Bicentennial Medal

The ARBC Coins and Medals Committee has unanimously proposed the striking of an official medal commemorating the Bicentennial. This medal could be produced in a set of 2 or 3 different sizes of which one might measure up to 3" in diameter and in different metals. It will be sponsored by the ARBC and struck by the United States Mint. In case working schedules of the Mint may make its striking there impossible, a private firm should be designated by the Committee for its execution. An Act of Congress is necessary to authorize this striking.

The Design

Only one obverse and one reverse design will be produced; they will be used unchanged on all the medals, regardless of size. The theme of this medal would have to be proposed by a group of leading historians, who might provide also the necessary documentary material to the artists.

The general consensus of the Panel is that the official Bicentennial Medal should be produced through an open competition, or in case of its failure by a closed competition, following procedures outlined above for the coins.

Award Medal

The Panel also agreed to produce medals which could be used as awards connected with the Bicentennial. Depending on further decisions of the Panel, either strikings in more valuable metals of the official Bicentennial Medal or a specially-designed medal should be issued. Its production should follow procedures similar to the ones outlined above.

Annual Medals

The ARBC also unanimously decided to sponsor the issuance of six yearly medals of a smaller diameter (1½") starting in 1971 and following in each successive year with a final issue in 1976. These medals will be distributed only in a philatelic-numismatic combination package and the profits from their sales are to be turned over to the ARBC. The intention of the distributors is to have the first philatelic-numismatic-package ready by July 4, 1971. Legislation would have to be enacted for this series.

The Design

For reasons of a tighter release schedule, as indicated above, the yearly medals should be produced by commissioning an artist chosen by the ARBC Coins and Medals Panel with the advise of some of our leading sculptors and art

critics. As to the historic content of these medals, the distributors would have to conform to themes proposed and approved by the ARBC Panel and its specialist advisors.

Since these medals would most likely be produced by the United States Mint, the entries of the artist or artists would have to comply with the conditions set by the Mint for similar strikings.

In order to bring more variety of style and execution, it would be desirable to have different artists produce the various single medals. For 1972, with more time and money on hand, the Panel might even consider holding competitions of either kind for the medals of 1972 to 1976. The final model before going into production should have the approval of the Panel as to historic accuracy in following the prescribed theme as well as to its artistic merits. The design of the cover for the package as well as the coordination of the themes on the stamps and medals used in these six yearly issues would have to be done in consultation with the Director of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing.

The Paper Money Program

The possibility of obtaining a commemorative note, either of a 2 dollar or a 50-cent denomination has been indicated. If the necessary legislation will be obtained, the design of the bill should relate to the Bicentennial Commemoration. In this case, like indicated above for coins and medals, a panel of historians should propose a suitable theme for its design while art experts would judge the entries. The procedures involving paper money will vary only to the effect that the final judgment in adopting certain designs for the note should rest, for security and technical reasons, with the Director of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing.

Elvira Clain-Stefanelli

Elvira Clain-Stefanelli

October 19, 1970

AMERICAN REVOLUTION BICENTENNIAL COMMISSION

COINS AND MEDALS ADVISORY PANEL

AGENDA FOR JANUARY 18, 1972 MEETING

Time: 9:00 a.m., Tuesday, January 18, 1972

Location: ARBC Headquarters, 736 Jackson Place, N. W., Washington, D. C.

(note: This is a short form Agenda and gives additional background information where appropriate to an item. A more detailed explanatory agenda will be sent early next week. It suggests specific considerations for certain agenda items.)

I. DISCUSSIONS AND DECISIONS REFERENCE MEDALS PROGRAM

A. SERIES OF STATE MEDALS (Recommendation No. 6)(copy attached)

Background. This item is on the agenda because many states have asked us for technical assistance (The attached letter from Mass is an example). Some states have already made arrangements with the private sector, though none has asked for official ARBC recognition of its proposed medal.

B. COMMEMORATIVE MEDALS (Recommendation No. 4)(copy attached)

Background. Recommendation No. 4 does not reveal that the intent of the Advisory Panel and the supporting material included in the submission for vote of the full Commission was for these commemorative medals to be struck by the U. S. Mint. The legislation now "on the hill" (HR 7987) and on which hearings have been held, does so explain. Further, the recommendation addresses itself to a Philatelic-Numismatic Combination (P.N.C.) only, although the proposed legislation is broad enough to permit solo annual commemorative medals.

C. AWARDS MEDAL (Recommendation No. 7)(copy attached)

Background. We are ready to proceed with this medal and need technical assistance from our expert Panel on design, composition and other implementation factors.

II. GUIDANCE AND ASSISTANCE FROM PANEL AS TO SCOPE OF PRIVATE SECTOR IN ABOVE THREE MEDALS AND IN THE CONTENT AND SPECIFICATIONS OF A REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL FROM THE PRIVATE SECTOR

Background. A matrix has been developed and is in the process of being reproduced and will be mailed next week. This, it is hoped will expedite resolution of this agenda item.

III. COMMEMORATIVE COIN (Recommendation No. 2)(copy attached)

Special presentation by R. Lynn Carroll, Deputy Executive Director for Program Development and Coordination.

IV. CURRENCY AND COINS OF THE REALM

A. Implementation procedures for Recommendation No. 1. (copy attached)

B. Research and implementation procedures for Recommendations 3a and 3b. (copies attached)

V. NATIONAL BICENTENNIAL MEDAL (Recommendation No. 5)(copy attached)

A. Establish Timetable

B. Research necessary to determine implementation procedures

(Prepared J.E.O., 1/11/72)

ARBC COINS AND MEDALS ADVISORY PANEL

ADDITIONAL EXPLANATORY AND BACKGROUND
MATERIAL FOR CERTAIN ITEMS ON THE AGENDA
OF THE JANUARY 18, 1972 MEETING

AGENDA ITEM I-A

On September 30, 1970, the Coins and Medals Advisory Panel of the ARBC unanimously recommended that "State Bicentennial Commissions establish State medals for distribution to the Public and that their medals be struck by Private Organizations". This recommendation is No. 6, and a copy has been previously furnished. In February 1971, the Commission approved and endorsed this recommendation.

In the discussion on this matter at the panel meeting, it is clear that the members felt that each State should retain control over its Bicentennial Medal program and could have as many different ones as it wanted - all to be designed and struck by the private sector. The transcript also manifests the hope of the Panel members that each State would have at least one medal which would include the official National symbol, fall within broad design guidelines and follow criteria for its use so that an official set of 50 State Medals would be available. These guidelines and procedure were to be developed as a result of further Advisory Panel discussion and decision.

In a memorandum dated June 1, 1971, to State Bicentennial Commission Chairmen and Representatives, the Acting State Coordinator said that "the Commission is prepared to assist in developing uniform standards for the production of such a State Medal for 1976. The Commission can assist in developing overall size, composition and design of each State Medal so that the public may have the opportunity of acquiring one official uniform set".

At the States' Seminar workshop in Chicago on October 8, 1971, the ARBC received some criticism for failing to provide guidance and leadership on the States' Medals program so as to mitigate the "intense pressure from private mints".

Some States have already made arrangements with the private sector, though none of them has asked for official ARBC recognition thereof. You are all aware of the Franklin Mint's 50 State Medal program, a copy of an advertisement for which is attached.

There is room for many questions and suggestions on this agenda, but the following are thought to require primary conceptual consideration:

1. Should the ARBC assume an active coordinating role in this matter? If yes, what form of approval is needed from the States?

2. What are the advantages and disadvantages to any State from participation in a set?

3. Must there be uniformity in design for a set to be a set? Is it possible that alternative choices could be had and still have design uniformity (Purely as an example: Could it be a uniform set if the obverse depicted the State Seal, or the State Capitol, or an important event in the States' history, or an important monument or shrine while the reverse depicted the ARBC symbol singly or in combination with the State Flag or Flower or Bird, and/or if there be one, the States' official Bicentennial symbol?).

4. Must all medals be of the same diameter and thickness in order for a set to be a set?

5. Must all medals be of the same relief (high or low) in order for a set to be a set?

6. Must all medals be of the same metal composition in order for a set to be a set?

7. Is there a fair method of devising an equitable sharing of profits among the States from the sale of sets?

(There are other items involved and most of them are pointed out in the Matrix, Agenda Item II, below).

AGENDA ITEM I-B

Commemorative Medals (Recommendation 4). The recommendation does not reveal that the intent of the Advisory Panel and the supporting material in the submission for vote of the full Commission was for these commemorative medals to be

struck by the U. S. Mint. On page 143 in the transcript of the advisory panels meeting on September 30, 1970, Chairman Lang in asking for the vote stated: "The voting will be on a combination Philatelic-numismatic package, as you have seen, to be produced if possible by the U.S. Mint, if legislation won't be passed then by a fairly chosen private firm or firms, its design and content to be proposed by this present advisory panel." The Chairman then added: "Would the Committee...(i.e., the panel)... feel it desirable to produce a series of six such packages starting in 1971, July 4, and the last one to be in 1976, July 4". The vote was taken and passed unanimously by those present, one member being absent. The U. S. Mint has subsequently reported that it has the capacity to strike these medals. The legislation now "on the Hill" (H.R. 7987) request the authority for the U.S. Mint to strike a series of commemorative medals and explanations in support of the Hill as well as the Chairman's testimony recorded this intent of the panel. The legislation as presented would enable such U. S. Mint struck medals to be issued on a solo basis. Although the recommendation addresses itself to a Philatelic-Numismatic Combination (PNC) only. The technical details in the implementation of these commemorative medals are many (as shown in the Matrix II below), but again, there are primary considerations to which it appears the panel should address itself:

1. Should the use of these medals be confined to a PNC? Might not solo medals also be issued?

2. This was originally conceived and intended as an ARBC revenue program. Several states have proposed that they share in the profits. How does the Panel feel about this? This question thus raises the issues of competition, confusion as to many medals, and the role of the private sector.

3. The commemorative medal is planned as an annual issue possibly through 1983. Should the R.F.P. be for one year, the whole period or part of the period?

4. Assuming that the U. S. Mint does strike these medals and that the Mints assay mailing list be used in the promotion of their sales, there is still much left to be done as shown in the Matrix (II below).

ANNOUNCING AN EXTRAORDINARY OPPORTUNITY FOR AMERICAN ARTISTS

The $5,000 Bicentennial Medal Design Competition

Sponsored by The Franklin Mint

THE FRANKLIN MINT, THE WORLD'S LARGEST COMPANY DEVOTED TO THE ART OF MEDALLIC SCULPTURE, IS PROUD TO ANNOUNCE AN EXTRAORDINARY OPPORTUNITY FOR AMERICAN ARTISTS. WE INVITE YOU TO PARTICIPATE IN THE $5,000 BICENTENNIAL MEDAL DESIGN COMPETITION.

THE COMPETITION IS OPEN TO ALL AMERICAN ARTISTS. ENTRIES MUST BE RECEIVED BY JANUARY 2, 1973 AND MUST REFLECT THE THEME.

THERE WILL BE A TOTAL OF TEN AWARDS, AS FOLLOWS:

First Prize	$5,000
Second Prize	$2,500
Third Prize	$1,000
Fourth Prize	$ 500
Fifth Prize	$ 250
Sixth Prize	$ 100
Seventh Prize	$ 100
Eighth Prize	$ 100
Ninth Prize	$ 100
Tenth Prize	$ 100

THE WINNING DESIGN WILL BE USED AS THE OBVERSE OF THE BICENTENNIAL MEDAL ISSUED BY THE FRANKLIN MINT. THE REVERSE WILL BE DESIGNED BY THE MINT'S ARTISTS.

EACH ENTRY MUST CONFORM TO THE SPECIFICATIONS DESCRIBED IN THE ACCOMPANYING RULES. ANY ENTRY NOT CONFORMING TO THESE RULES WILL BE DISQUALIFIED.

ALL DESIGNS MUST BE SUBMITTED UNMOUNTED AND FREE FROM ANY FOLDS OR WRINKLES.

JUDGING

THE ENTRIES WILL BE JUDGED ANONYMOUSLY BY A DISTINGUISHED PANEL OF ARTISTS AND SCULPTORS. THE DECISION OF THE JUDGES WILL BE FINAL AND BINDING IN ALL RESPECTS. ALL ENTRIES BECOME THE PROPERTY OF THE FRANKLIN MINT AND WILL NOT BE RETURNED. THE FRANKLIN MINT RESERVES THE RIGHT TO REJECT ANY OR ALL ENTRIES.

EXHIBITION

THE WINNING DESIGNS AND A SELECTION OF THE OTHER ENTRIES WILL BE EXHIBITED AT THE FRANKLIN MINT. THE WINNING DESIGNS WILL BE EXHIBITED AT THE AMERICAN NUMISMATIC ASSOCIATION CONVENTION IN PHILADELPHIA IN AUGUST 1973.

COPYRIGHT

ALL ENTRIES BECOME THE PROPERTY OF THE FRANKLIN MINT AND WILL NOT BE RETURNED. THE FRANKLIN MINT RESERVES THE RIGHT TO REJECT ANY OR ALL ENTRIES.

THE DESIGNS SELECTED WILL BE USED AS THE OBVERSE OF THE BICENTENNIAL MEDAL ISSUED BY THE FRANKLIN MINT. THE REVERSE WILL BE DESIGNED BY THE MINT'S ARTISTS.

THE DESIGNS SELECTED WILL BE USED AS THE OBVERSE OF THE BICENTENNIAL MEDAL ISSUED BY THE FRANKLIN MINT. THE REVERSE WILL BE DESIGNED BY THE MINT'S ARTISTS.

HOW TO ENTER

ALL ENTRIES MUST BE ACCOMPANIED BY THE OFFICIAL ENTRY FORM. FOR A COPY OF THE OFFICIAL RULES AND ENTRY FORM, WRITE TO:

Dear Ms. Farrell -

I have never received my reimbursement for expenses to the last Coins and Medals Panel ARBC meeting in Washington.

From the desk of
ERIC P. NEWMAN

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE ISSUANCE OF SEVERAL MEDALS TO COMMEMORATE THE BICENTENNIAL OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

i. The date of release of such medals should coincide with Independence Day of the years 1971 through 1976.

j. Quantities to be struck should be left open until a useful estimate based on the response to advertising and solicitation of orders can be obtained.

k. Post Office cooperation in orders and deliveries should be sought.

l. In addition to the six medals outlined under Sections a-k, I would recommend the adoption of one or more medals, different in design, for distribution with the issuance of stamps commemorating the occasion. These medals should be tied in by design to the commemorative postage stamps, and could be mailed in philatelic mailers. Such a philatelic-numismatic combination has a great revenue potential for the A. N. B. C. The Commission could avail itself of the "99 Company" which has a patent for such a combination mailer. The order filling and mailing could be turned over to an independent agency such as the Paramount International Coin Corporation if ANBC or the Post Office Department cannot handle the matter.

(Submitted by Henry Grunthal
and revised by Eric P. Newman.
Commentary requested promptly).

Numismatic News
Serving Coin Collectors Since 1952
WEEKLY
PHONE 715 445-2217 IOLA, WIS. 54945

February 5, 1972

Mr. Eric P. Newman
6450 Cecil Avenue
St. Louis, Mo., 63105

Dear Eric:-

Enclosed I am returning the pictures of the Liberty nickel case, for the loan of which I again thank you very much.

It was good to see you again in Washington.

I was disturbed, as I gather you were, that at the panel meeting the Mint represented a position implying that all that can be expected as a nod to the bicentennial on the nation's coinage is dual dating. The following day I returned to the Hill and discovered that they were for some selfish reason, which I can not fully place my finger on, projecting only an internally held position.

Although I spoke to neither Mr. Patman, nor Mrs. Sullivan directly on this point, I was informed by a mighty reliable source that both are interested in seeing at least some distinctive circulating coins. The point is, however, that if the legislation must be originated on the Hill it might have tough sledding, but that little, if any resistance would be found if the legislation was originated by the ARBC-President route.

That leaves the real problem being relative inaction on the part of ARBC, as Congressman Schwengel pointed out in our meeting. They apparently have little knowledge that traffic travels in both directions on Pennsylvania Avenue. That medal bill, which was cleared for Senate floor action yesterday by Senator Sparkman's Banking Committee, just a day after it was sent over from the House, because of Mint interest and action, not ARBC action.

Sincerely yours,

Clifford Mishler
Numismatic Editor

CM/ns

ERIC P. NEWMAN NUMISMATIC EDUCATION SOCIETY

6450 Cecil Avenue, St. Louis 5, Missouri

February 10, 1972

Mr. Clifford Mishler
Numismatic News Weekly
Iola, Wisconsin 54945

Dear Cliff:

I was very disturbed at the proposition for dual dating of coins, just as you were. As I see it, it is very dull to the public, not original, and completely ineffective for a celebration. It is just tokenism, if I dare use that term non-numismatically.

My suggestion is that we wait until the medal bill passes Congress and is signed by the President and then we find out why it passed so easily. Whoever pushed it through should then try to push through something nice relating to the coinage and the paper money.

Kindest regards.

Sincerely yours,

ERIC P. NEWMAN NUMISMATIC
EDUCATION SOCIETY

EPN/atb